

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

THOMAS J. YEGGE JR.,

Civ. No. 10-524-CL

Petitioner,

v.

GUY HALL,

**ORDER**

Respondent.

---

**PANNER, District Judge:**

Magistrate Judge Mark D. Clarke filed a Report and Recommendation, and the matter is now before this court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court makes a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach., Inc., 656 F. 2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981).

Here, plaintiff objects to the Report and Recommendation. I


have, therefore, given this matter de novo review. I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Clarke.

**CONCLUSION**

Magistrate Judge Clarke's Report and Recommendation (#21) is adopted. The petition (#2) is denied. Petitioner's motion regarding obstruction of justice (#25) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 23 day of December, 2010.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Owen M. Panner", is written over a horizontal line.

OWEN M. PANNER  
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE